

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/004,968	12/05/2001	Davis T.W. Ng	P05424US1	7842
27407	7590 11/20/2003		EXAM	INER
MCKEE, VOORHEES & SEASE, P.L.C. ATTN: PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY 801 GRAND AVENUE, SUITE 3200			VOGEL, NANCY T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
DES MOINES, IA 50309-2721		1636		

DATE MAILED: 11/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/004,968	NG ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examin r	Art Unit				
•	Nancy Vogel	1636				
The MAILING DATE of this communication						
Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR R THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory properties to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a con. , a reply within the statutory minimum of the period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC statute, cause the application to become a	reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely. DNTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	າ					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b)	This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims						
4) \boxtimes Claim(s) <u>1-42</u> is/are pending in the application						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.	6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) 1-42 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _		disapproved by the Examiner.				
		disapproved by the Examiner.				
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority docur	ments have been received					
<u> </u>		Application No.				
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage 						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).						
a) The translation of the foreign languag 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for do	* *					
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No.	8) 5) Notice o	v Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) f Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 1636

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-12, 15-23, and 26-31, drawn to a method of making a heterologous protein in fungi, classified in class 435, subclass 69.1.
- II. Claims 13, 24, 32, and 34-42, drawn to a mutant yeast, and a transformed yeast, and a vector, classified in class 435, subclass 254.1, 254.11, 254.2 and 320.1.
- III. Claims 14, 25, and 33, drawn to a protein, classified in class 530, subclass 350.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

The products of Group II and the product of Group III, are chemically, biologically, and functionally distinct from each other and thus one does not render the other obvious. The product of each group is not needed to produce the products of the other groups (each of which can be isolated from cells or organisms, made synthetically, and/or are self-replicating without the need for the isolated products of the other groups). Therefore, the inventions of the groups are capable of supporting separate patents.

Inventions of Group I and III are related as process of making and product made.

The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the

Art Unit: 1636

process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be made by an in vitro chemical synthesis technique such as Merrifield synthesis.

Inventions of Group II and I are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product as claimed can be used as a hybridization probe in hybridization studies.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. Further more, especially in instances where the classifications are the same, the non-patent literature searches required for each of these inventions are not co-extensive, hence said searches would be burdensome. Therefore, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the

Application/Control Number: 10/004,968 Page 4

Art Unit: 1636

rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nancy Vogel whose telephone number is (703) 308-4548. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 - 4:00, Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Irem Yucel, Ph.D. can be reached on (703) 305-1998. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/004,968 Page 5

Art Unit: 1636

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

ntv

TENTO TO LE TELLEY
PRIMARY EXAMINER